



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HUGHES LAW FIRM, PLLC
PACIFIC MERIDIAN PLAZA, SUITE 302
4164 MERIDIAN STREET
BELLINGHAM WA 98226-5583

COPY MAILED

NOV 06 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Steven H. RICE :
Application No. 09/814,581 : LETTER
Filed: March 21, 2001 :
Attorney Docket No. P313641 :

This is a letter regarding the renewed petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed May 05, 2008, to revive the above-identified application. The petition decision of March 05, 2008 set a shortened statutory period for reply of two (2) months. Accordingly, the above-identified renewed petition was timely filed.

The renewed petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is not a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue and publication fees on or before August 16, 2002, as required by the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due, mailed May 16, 2002. Accordingly, the date of abandonment of this application is August 17, 2002.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required by 37 CFR 1.137(d). Where there is a question as to whether either

the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Director may require additional information. See MPEP 711.03(c)(II)(C) and (D). The instant petition still lacks item (3).

The showing of record still raises questions as to whether the abandonment of this application was unintentional within the meaning of 35 USC 41 (a)(7) and CFR 1.137(b).

There are three periods to be considered during the evaluation of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b):

- (1) the delay in reply that originally resulted in the abandonment;
- (2) the delay in filing an initial petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the application; and
- (3) the delay in filing a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the application.

Currently, the delay has not been shown to the satisfaction of the Director to be unintentional for periods (1) and (2).

As to Period (1):

The patent statute at 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) authorizes the Director to revive an "unintentionally abandoned application." The legislative history of Public Law 97-247 reveals that the purpose of 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) is to permit the Office to have more discretion than in 35 U.S.C. §§ 133 or 151 to revive abandoned applications in appropriate circumstances, but places a limit on this discretion, stating that "[u]nder this section a petition accompanied by either a fee of \$500 or a fee of \$50 **would not be granted where the abandonment or the failure to pay the fee for issuing the patent was intentional as opposed to being unintentional or unavoidable.**" [emphasis added]. See H.R. Rep. No. 542, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 6-7 (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S.C.C.A.N. 770-71. The revival of an intentionally abandoned application is antithetical to the meaning and intent of the statute and regulation.

35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) authorizes the Director to accept a petition "for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application for a patent." As amended December 1, 1997, 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) provides that a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by a statement that the delay was unintentional, but provides that "[t]he Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional." Where, as here, there is a question whether the

initial delay was unintentional, the petitioner must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unintentional within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) and 37 CFR 1.137(b). See In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989); 37 CFR 1.137(b). Here, in view of the inordinate delay (almost 31 months) in resuming prosecution, there is a question whether the entire delay was unintentional. Petitioner should note that the issue is not whether some of the delay was unintentional by any party; rather, the issue is whether the entire delay has been shown to the satisfaction of the Director to be unintentional.

The question under 37 CFR 1.137(b) for period (1) is whether the delay on the part of the party having the right or authority to reply to avoid abandonment (or not reply) was unintentional. Accordingly, any renewed petition must clearly identify the party having the right to reply to avoid abandonment on August 17, 2002. That party, in turn must explain what effort(s) was made to further reply to the outstanding Office action and, further, why no reply was filed. If no effort was made to further reply, then that party must explain why the delay in this application does not result from a deliberate course of action (or inaction).

Although the renewed petition includes affidavits of Mr. Steven Rice and Mr. Jason Brewer and remarks of Applicant's representative Michael Hughes, the renewed petition does not clearly identify such as the party having the right to reply to avoid abandonment on August 17, 2002, i.e. was it Mr. Stephen Rice or Mr. Robert Hughes, other persons at Hughes and Schacht P.L.L.C.? Therefore it is unclear whether the petition even includes an explanation from such party as to the efforts made to reply to the outstanding Office action and further, why no reply was filed. Even with regard to such affidavits and remarks, although the affidavits of Mr. Steven Rice and Mr. Jason Brewer and remarks of Applicant's representative Michael Hughes refer to general periods of time, e.g. early 2000, the latter part of 2007, etc. they include no specifics with regard to the receipt of the Notice of Issue and Allowance mailed May 16, 2002 nor efforts made to reply or not reply thereto prior to the abandonment of August 17, 2002. No explanation from the counsel of record at such time, Mr. Robert Hughes, is presented in the renewed petition nor an explanation as to why there is no such explanation.

No copies of any correspondence relating to the filing, or to not filing a further reply to the outstanding Office action from responsible person(s), e.g. Robert Hughes, as required, and whoever else was involved with this application at the time of abandonment are clearly presented by the renewed petition. No statements as required from any and all responsible person(s) having firsthand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the

lack of a reply to the outstanding Office action, e.g. any and all members of Hughes & Schacht, are clearly presented by the renewed petition. As the courts have made clear, it is pointless for the USPTO to revive a long abandoned application without an adequate showing that the delay did not result from a deliberate course of action. See Lawman Armor v. Simon, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10843, 74 USPQ2d 1633 (DC EMich 2005); Field Hybrids, LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp., 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1159 (D. Minn Jan. 27, 2005); Lumenyte Int'l Corp. v. Cable Lite Corp., Nos. 96-1011, 96-1077, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 16400, 1996 WL 383927 (Fed. Cir. July 9, 1996) (unpublished) (patents held unenforceable due to a finding of inequitable conduct in submitting an inappropriate statement that the abandonment was unintentional).

As to Period (2):

Likewise, where the applicant deliberately chooses not to seek or persist in seeking the revival of an abandoned application, or where the applicant deliberately chooses to delay seeking the revival of an abandoned application, the resulting delay in seeking revival of the abandoned application cannot be considered as "unintentional" within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.137(b). See MPEP 711.03(c).

The language of both 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) and 37 CFR 1.137(b) are clear and unambiguous, and, furthermore, without qualification. That is, the delay in filing the reply during prosecution, as well as in filing the petition seeking revival, must have been, without qualification, "unintentional" for the reply to now be accepted on petition. The Office requires that the entire delay be at least unintentional as a prerequisite to revival of an abandoned application to prevent abuse and injury to the public. See H.R. Rep. No. 542, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S.C.C.A.N. 771 ("[i]n order to prevent abuse and injury to the public the Commissioner . . . could require applicants to act promptly after becoming aware of the abandonment"). The December 1997 change to 37 CFR 1.137 did not create any new right to overcome an intentional delay in seeking revival, or in renewing an attempt at seeking revival, of an abandoned application. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53160 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 87 (October 21, 1997), which clearly stated that any protracted delay (here, over 1 year) could trigger, as here, a request for additional information. As the courts have since made clear, a protracted delay in seeking revival, as here, requires a petitioner's detailed explanation seeking to excuse the delay as opposed to USPTO acceptance of a general allegation of unintentional delay. See Lawman Armor v. Simon, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10843, 74 USPQ2d 1633, at 1637-8 (DC

EMich 2005); Field Hybrids, LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp., 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1159 (D. Minn Jan. 27, 2005) at *21-*23.

As discussed supra the renewed petition does not clearly present statements as required from any and all persons then at Hughes and Schacht P.L.L.C. and the responsible person(s) having firsthand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the protracted delay, after the abandonment date, e.g. Mr. Robert Hughes, in seeking revival. The affidavits and remarks which are presented by the renewed petition do not clearly explain the delay from the date of abandonment of August 17, 2002 until the filing of the initial petition on February 7, 2008 such as the date the Applicant first became aware of the abandonment and how such delay in discovery occurred despite the exercise of due care or diligence on the part of the Applicant.

As noted in MPEP 711.03(c)(II), subsection D, in instances in which such petition was not filed within 1 year of the date of abandonment of the application, applicants should include:

- (A) the date that the applicant first became aware of the abandonment of the application; and
- (B) a showing as to how the delay in discovering the abandoned status of the application occurred despite the exercise of due care or diligence on the part of the applicant.

In either instance, applicant's failure to carry the burden of proof to establish that the "entire" delay was "unavoidable" or "unintentional" may lead to the denial of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), regardless of the circumstances that originally resulted in the abandonment of the application. See also New York University v. Autodesk, 2007 U.S. DIST LEXIS, U.S. District LEXIS 50832, *10 -*12 (S.D.N.Y. 2007) (protracted delay in seeking revival undercuts assertion of unintentional delay).


Any renewed petition may be addressed as follows:

By Mail: Mail Stop PETITION
 Commissioner for Patents
 P. O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: U. S. Patent and Trademark Office
 Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions
 Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

By fax: (571) 273-8300
ATTN: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Karin Reichle at (571) 272-6051 or in her absence, the undersigned at (571)272-7099.



David Bucci
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions